

REMARKS

In the aforesaid Office Action, claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Condon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,188,596), and claims 8-10, 12, and 14-26 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Condon et al. in view of Muni et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,316,706). Claims 8-10 and 12-26 are pending.


The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Condon et al., and claims 8-10, 12, and 14-26 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Condon et al. in view of Muni, stating in the Response to Arguments section that Condon figure 7 teaches a “non-transparent wall with a plurality of holes or *windows 68*” and taking the most proximally positioned transparent window, there are non-transparent shaft sections distal to it.

Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the substantially transparent shaft section has a substantially transparent wall which extends around the circumference of the shaft as in claims 8 and 13, or is substantially transparent around the circumference of the outer tubular member as in claim 22. Support for the amendment can be found in Figure 2. In Condon, the holes or windows which form the transparent shaft section extend around only a small portion of the circumference of the shaft. In contrast, in the embodiments set forth in Applicants' claims, the substantially transparent shaft section is substantially transparent around the circumference of the shaft.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By: 
Günther O. Hanke
Registration No. 32,989

GOH/PMM/psm

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201